

**ADDENDUM #1  
TO SPEC. 04-224  
RFP Engineering Services, Urban Drainage, Phase II,  
Preliminary Engineering Study**

Addendum #1 to Spec. 04-224 for RFP Engineering Services, proposals to be received on Wednesday, September 1, 2004 at 12:00 noon.

The following questions have been asked:

Question: Section 1.1 lists 18 study areas, but I could only find 16 on the map. Is this correct?

Answer: The correct number of areas for this study is 16.

Question: The RFP appears to be similar in scope to the Phase I project. Do you anticipate a large amount of field work to be included in the project, in order to verify and provide QC on the existing data? Was this a major component of the Phase I project? We are trying to get a handle on the amount of time and budget to build into the schedule for this effort.

Answer: Phase I did include field verification of some, not all, of the data used in the analysis. Since this is a preliminary study the typical time allowed for field verification should be approx. 1 day per basin.

Question: There appears to be some area of overlap between this Phase and Phase I, near the State Fairgrounds. Was all of the Phase I work completed, and if so, is a copy of the report (and the prioritization methodology) available?

Answer: Some of the basins analyzed in phase I are contained within basins proposed for Phase II. All of the information gathered in Phase I will be available for use in the analysis of the basins for Phase II

- Question: Section 2.2.1.1.5 states that the Rational method will be used for hydrologic analysis. Several of the study areas are much larger than 150 acres; is the intent to model individual sub-basins within these large study areas?
- Answer: City design standards do state that the rational method should not be used for areas over 150 acres. To be consistent with what is used for pipe sizing calculations in development and CIP projects the rational method will be the method of choice for this project. However, there may be a few circumstances, such as designed detention areas, in which a flow needs to be calculated using the SCS method.
- Question: In section 2.6.1.6 model outputs are to include attributes listed in 2.6.3, but there is no 2.6.3. Is the listing intended to be that shown in 2.6.1.4, or 2.3.2, or both?
- Answer: 2.6.1.6 refers back to the information in 2.6.1.4 not 2.3.2
- Question: Phase I Urban drainage study was to include a format for standardization of the database. Will that format be used for this phase and if so, we assume the final report and instructional manual from that first project will be made available to the Phase II consultant. Is this true?
- Answer: The database information compiled in Phase I will be used as a template for information gathered in Phase II. Any data compiled in Phase I including the instructional manual will be available for use in Phase II.
- Question: Will the final proposed project ranking list called for in 2.5.1 and 2.7.1.2 have to include previous projects identified in the Phase I project or will each sub-drainage area shown on the map be prioritized separately? Will there be additional phases to analyze other drainage areas not covered by Phase I and Phase II?
- Answer: The final ranking list should consist of all projects identified in Phase I and Phase II. It is intended to continue with more phases in the future contingent upon funding from future storm water bonds. Future phases may be ongoing until all storm water systems believed to have deficiencies have been analyzed.

All other terms and conditions to remain unchanged.

Dated this 26<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2004.

Purchasing Department

Mary L. Matson  
Assistant Purchasing Agent